

# ***2008-2009 School Improvement Plan Submission Packet***

**For Title I Schools at Level 2 or above**



**Due to EED – November 3, 2008**

**Contact:**

Jon Paden, School Improvement Program Manager  
Alaska Department of Education & Early Development  
801 West 10<sup>th</sup> Street, Suite 200  
PO Box 110500, Juneau, AK 99811-0500  
[jon.paden@alaska.gov](mailto:jon.paden@alaska.gov)  
(907) 465-8720

[www.eed.state.ak.us](http://www.eed.state.ak.us)

# Overview of 2008-2009 School Improvement Plan Process

**School improvement planning is a school responsibility.** All Title I schools identified at Level 2 or above are required by NCLB and Alaska statute and regulations to create or revise a School Improvement plan that meets federal (NCLB 1116(b)(3)(A)(i-x)) and state requirements (AK Reg 4 AAC 06.845). The School Improvement Plan should be aligned with the goals of the district plan and have objectives that are reflective of the instructional needs of the students at the school site. The needs of the school's students will be addressed through the specific actions the school chooses to implement (instructional strategies, professional development, parent involvement) that are congruent with the district's goals as stated in the District Improvement Plan as well as with the school's objectives.

If a school is in improvement status and the district is not required to write an improvement plan, the school will analyze its own data and identify objectives based on this analysis. The objectives will be reflective of the needs of only the school site with actions matching the needs of the students.

**The district is responsible for providing technical assistance** to schools in creating an improvement plan. The district is also responsible for creating a peer review process to review **and approve each required school improvement plan**. The district submits the approved plans to the Department of Education & Early Development (EED) **no later than November 3, 2008**.

Each district will receive an allocation of School Improvement funds that must be spent on Title I schools in Level 2 or above. A district may submit one budget and narrative for the schools within the district or may submit one budget and narrative per school site.

**EED will review the School Improvement Plans and budgets submitted for alignment with the federal and state requirements, alignment to the district improvement plan and for alignment between budgets and narratives and their relationship to the improvement plan.** If the plans do not meet the requirements, the department will contact the district within 5 working days of receipt of the plan to specify any revisions needed to meet the federal and state requirements.

The School Improvement Plan should be evaluated throughout the year to determine the effectiveness of the actions identified. A collection of data should be analyzed and a summary of the outcomes should be forwarded to the district office for review at the end of the school year. These outcomes should be further discussed at the school site to determine the next steps in the school improvement process – continue with action, alter action to more specifically meet the needs of the students, or implement a new action that will better meet the students' needs. All actions implemented should be scientifically research based.

Note that the last column on the planning chart is shaded to allow the school to evaluate its progress in relation to the goals, objectives, and selected strategies. It is not necessary to send this information to EED.

### Consequences for Schools

If the implementation of a School Improvement Plan does not result in making adequate yearly progress, the district will be required to take progressive consequences. At **Level 4**, **the district** must take one of the specified corrective actions on a school and complete page 11 of the School Improvement Plan in addition to the plan itself. At **Level 5**, **the district** must use the first year at Level 5 to create an “Alternative Governance Plan for Level 5 Schools.” The district creates this plan for restructuring the school and must submit this plan as a separate form to EED by April 15, 2009. The Alternative Governance plan is in addition to the School Improvement Plan due to EED on November 3, 2008.

### Consequences for Districts

**School Improvement Plans must meet all federal and state requirements or federal and state payments will be withheld until such plans are received by EED.**

### Required elements of School Improvement Plans

[NCLB 1116(b)(3)(A)(i-x), CFR 200.41(a-c), AK Reg 4 AAC 06.845]

<i>Plan requirement</i>	<i>EED Review criteria</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Develop plan in <b>consultation with parents, school staff, LEA, and others.</b></li></ul>	Provide list of names of participants showing representation from each group.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Cover a <b>2-year period (submitted one year at a time).</b></li></ul>	Include timeline and dates for the current school year.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Identify <b>specific annual, measurable objectives</b> for continuous and substantial progress by each subgroup for being proficient on the state academic assessments.</li></ul>	Measurable objective(s) provided.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Determine policies and practices that have the <b>greatest likelihood of all subgroups of students meeting the state’s academic standards.</b></li></ul>	Strategies proposed target reasons for not making AYP.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Utilize <b>scientifically based research strategies</b> to improve core academic subjects; specific to the issues that caused the school to be identified for school improvement.</li></ul>	Briefly cite the agency or source of the scientifically based research for each instructional strategy or curriculum proposed.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Provide an assurance that the school <b>will spend at least 10% of the site allocation on high-quality professional development</b> for teachers and principals to address the academic problem(s) that caused the school to be identified and meets requirements for professional development. (section 1119).</li></ul>	Signature required on cover/assurance page.

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Describe the <b>professional development, including teacher mentoring activities or programs, and how it will be used to remove the school from school improvement</b> status.</li> </ul>	Professional development description provided in plan.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Describe the parent notification process</b> to explain school improvement status and how parents can become involved in addressing issues that caused the school to be in improvement status.</li> </ul>	Description of notification process provided along with a copy of the letter sent to parents.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Describe the responsibilities of the school and district, and the responsibilities agreed to by the department, including <b>technical assistance that will be provided.</b></li> </ul>	Describe technical assistance to be provided by the district or others.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Identify strategies to promote <b>effective parent involvement.</b></li> </ul>	Parent involvement strategies provided in plan.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Provide, as appropriate, extended learning opportunities</b> (before school, after school, summer).</li> </ul>	Describe any extended learning opportunities that are proposed in the plan.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>If the school has any proficient students whose scores have declined for any reason other than regression to the mean, <b>address what measures the school will take to ensure that those students remain proficient in future years.*</b></li> </ul>	Describe measures to ensure that students remain proficient in future years.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>FOR LEVEL 4 SCHOOLS ONLY – Corrective Action summary.</b></li> </ul>	Describe corrective action <b>taken by district</b> for a school at Level 4.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Describe district peer review of School Improvement Plan.</b></li> </ul>	List members of district peer review team and describe process for district review and approval of school improvement plan.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Provide a budget and budget narrative for all School Improvement funds (at district or school site level).</b></li> </ul>	Budget and budget narrative match and the funds spent are a direct reflection of needs as identified by the School Improvement Plan.

**\*This is a new element based on the amended regulation 4 AAC 06.845(c) (13) related to the calculation of AYP of growth in student academic performance.**

## School Improvement Process

The department recommends a continuous school improvement planning process. In the school improvement process the district may wish to include the following to ensure the academic needs of students are addressed. The process might contain the following steps: 1) analysis of data (achievement, demographic, perception), 2) determine measurable objectives as based on needs identified through data analysis, 3) identify actions for implementation to support the objectives (these will include professional development and parent involvement), 4) identify ways to progress monitor students and evaluate meeting the objectives and 5) monitor implementation and effectiveness of the plan. The process and plan presented are not intended to replace other more comprehensive school reform or improvement efforts, but rather to complement those processes and focus on the specific areas that are causing the school to miss adequate yearly progress targets.

The following companion documents are available on the EED website under Forms & Grants, School/District Improvement (<http://www.eed.state.ak.us/forms/home.cfm>).

- Budget and Budget Narrative packet - **required** for requesting School Improvement funds
- School Improvement Plan Resource Guide – an optional step by step guide through the school improvement planning process



# School Improvement Plan

## School Year 2008-2009

### Cover Sheet

**School Improvement Level (check one):**    2   ☒    3   ☐    4   ☐    5   ☐    **Year** 2008-09

<b>School Name:</b>	Riverbend Elementary	<b>District Name:</b>	Juneau School District
<b>Principal's Name:</b>	Carmen Katasse	<b>District School Improvement Contact for this school:</b>	Kimberly Homme
<b>Phone (907)</b>	907-463-1819	<b>Phone (907)</b>	907-780-2030
<b>Fax (907)</b>	907-463-1792	<b>Fax (907)</b>	907-780-2029
<b>Principal's Email:</b>	Carmen_Katasse@jsd.k12.ak.us	<b>District Contact Email:</b>	Kimberly_Homme@jsd.k12.ak.us

- Assurance:** A district peer review team has reviewed the School Improvement Plan for the above named school under NCLB guidelines and has approved the documents in the Submission Packet as a true representation of the School Improvement Plan that will be carried out at this site. The district team has approved this plan. *By our signatures below, we agree that the requirements for Title I schools in Level 2 or above of School Improvement as designated and outlined in NCLB Section 1116 and Alaska Regulations 4 AAC 06.835-880, have been met. The school will spend a minimum of 10% of its Title I allocation on professional development related to the reasons it is designated for school improvement.*

\_\_\_\_\_  
*Principal's signature*

November 3, 2008

\_\_\_\_\_  
*Date*

\_\_\_\_\_  
*Superintendent or designee's signature*

November 3, 2008

\_\_\_\_\_  
*Date*

### School Accountability Planning Team

Regulation requires a school to consult with a variety of participants from the school and the community: teachers, administrators, other school staff, parents, and the community to be served. Please list members of the team and their roles.

<i>Printed Name</i>	<i>Role within the school/community (i.e. 4<sup>th</sup> Grade teacher, PTA parent, etc.)</i>	<i>Roles/Responsibilities tied to school improvement plan</i>
<b>Parents (planning team from April 2008):</b>		
<b>Sean Reishus O'Brien</b>	<b>Site Council liaison to School Board / 2008 Juneau School Board Member</b>	<b>Parent Consultant</b>
<b>David Deitz</b>	<b>Site Council member</b>	<b>Parent consultant</b>
<b>John Lohrey</b>	<b>Site Council member</b>	<b>Parent consultant</b>
<b>Rhoda Yadao</b>	<b>Site Council member</b>	<b>Parent consultant</b>
<b>Shannon Dilley</b>	<b>Site Council member</b>	<b>Parent consultant</b>
<b>Teachers &amp; other staff (planning team from April 2008):</b>		
<b>Carmen Katasse</b>	<b>Riverbend Principal/Site Acct Plan</b>	<b>Site Instructional Improvement</b>
<b>Doug Badilla</b>	<b>Special Education</b>	<b>Instructional Support Team Member / Site Staff Dev Planning</b>
<b>Karen Doxey</b>	<b>Literacy Leader / Title I Teacher</b>	<b>Instructional Support Team Member / Site Staff Dev Planning</b>
<b>Jan Faure</b>	<b>English as Second Language</b>	<b>Instructional Support Team Member / Site Staff Dev Planning</b>
<b>Brenda Weaver</b>	<b>Content Area Literacy Specialist</b>	<b>Instructional Support Team Member / Site Staff Dev Planning</b>
<b>Sheryl Wittig</b>	<b>Extended Learning Instructor/Site Council Member/Parent</b>	<b>Instructional Support Team Member / Site Staff Dev Planning</b>
<b>Tisa Becker</b>	<b>Site Council Classroom Representative</b>	<b>Site Improvement Plan Implementation</b>
<b>Barbara Bechtold</b>	<b>Site Council Classified Staff Representative</b>	<b>Site Improvement Plan Implementation</b>
<b>Deb Cox</b>	<b>Site Council Specialist Representative</b>	<b>Site Improvement Plan Implementation</b>

### District Peer Review Team

Identify the members of the peer review team that reviewed this plan for the district.

<i>Printed Name</i>	<i>Title or Assignment</i>	<i>Roles/Responsibilities tied to School Improvement Plan</i>
Laury Scandling	Assistant Superintendent	District Improvement Plan Co-Facilitator / Instructional Improvement / Staff Development
Kimberly Homme	Federal Programs Coordinator	District Improvement Plan Co-Facilitator/ Staff Development
Phil Loseby	Curriculum and Assessment Coordinator	Data analysis/JSD student achievement report/staff development planning
Haifa Sadighi	ESL/ELL Specialist / Instructional Support Team Coordinator	Instructional improvement / Staff Development

**1. Describe the process used to notify parents of the school improvement status and of their opportunities to be involved in addressing the academic issues that caused the school to be identified for improvement. Please include a copy of the notification sent to parents.**

There are numerous ways that district parents are invited to participate in improvement planning to assist Riverbend Elementary to meet AYP. Riverbend Elementary advertised in their school newsletter and on the outside marquee the School Report Card meeting and the Site Council meetings times and dates where the topic was discussed and the literature further explaining school improvement information was distributed.

The following is a description of the Riverbend Site Accountability Planning Process. The site accountability planning process provided information for the school improvement plan. The action steps were introduced at the April 2008 Riverbend Site Council Meeting and reviewed again at the September 2008 Site Council Meeting. At the November 2008 Site Council Meeting, the School Improvement Plan was reviewed and the alignment with the School Accountability Plan was articulated. A notice of that meeting was provided in the November edition of the school newsletter which was published as follows:

#### SITE COUNCIL

Site Council Agenda: Our next Site council meeting is on November 13th. The agenda will include going over our site improvement plan, making comments, giving feedback, and sharing ideas. Our special guest will be Kimberly Homme from the office of instructional services. She will discuss the District improvement plan and What this all means for the JSD. We are actively recruiting parents to join, so if you are interested please join us on Thursday (11/13/08).

For several years, Riverbend has utilized a well-articulated strategic planning process (the Site Accountability Plan) designed to focus on improving student academic success. The plan is an effective and integrated tool for documenting the following aspects associated with improving achievement:



- Student performance data
- School Improvement Plan
- Parent Involvement Plan
- Staff Development Plan

The Site Accountability Plans are developed through a dynamic, recursive process that includes: guided analysis of student performance data, input from parents and community through Site Council review and reflective analysis of teacher capacity to support student success. The Accountability Plans goals and action plans have corresponding measurable assessments that are aligned with State Standards. Sites report out progress toward their goals and refinement of their Accountability Plans in a formal report that is a core of the Juneau School District Report Card.

### Instructional Improvement Planning

This section includes a description of the process for instructional improvement at each school. It also describes how teachers, site council members, parents, students and other stakeholder groups are involved in the process.

### Data Analysis:

This school improvement effort is based on the scientifically based research process of informing decisions based on accurate data. Through the Sites' Accountability Plan process, each school has a team that collectively examines multi-dimensional data that is gathered to assess students' progress towards Alaska Standards. Sites perform a gap analysis to identify any disparity between student learning needs and the staff capacity to fill those needs. School sites set goals and implement teaching strategies and staff development to address areas that need to be strengthened. This process includes examining the outcomes and continuing to refine the goals and action plans resulting in a system of continuous improvement.

The Site Accountability Plans begin with a comprehensive data analysis of student assessment data over time by sub population. The narrative section of the plans are built around the following questions:

How does the data presented compare with the prior year target?

Does the data agree with the following data sources; test scores, grades, JSD assessment data, and AYP information?

What are the particular subgroups not meeting AYP or your prior year targets for the CORE?

Focusing only on your targeted sub-groups, what does the data show about growth over time?

Are the "focus" sub-groups weak in particular subject areas – reading, writing, and math?

Within the subject areas, what are the particular skills or concepts your targeted sub-groups demonstrate as needs? (Please cite data:

How many students have that need? In what area? Based on what data?

Is attendance during state mandated assessments affecting your school's performance on AYP?

### Action Plan

What strategies have you used previously to address this (these needs)?

Is there evidence that some activities have been successful and will be continued?

Please list the successful strategies and cite the data that demonstrates

the success.

Is there evidence that some strategies/programs do not show a demonstrated success for the targeted population(s)?

How will you change the strategies or enhance the successful strategies/programs?

What are you going to do to address each area of focus?

- classroom strategies
- intervention strategies
- parent involvement plan/strategies
- professional development strategies
- student supports outside the regular classroom

At this juncture, the Site Accountability Plan and Site Improvement Plan have been aligned and are essentially similar documents with the same focus: a plan for improved student performance.

**2. Describe the peer review process that the district used to review and approve this School Improvement Plan.**

April 2007, District received a draft of Riverbend's Site Accountability Plan

May 2007, District provided feedback to Riverbend for improving the Site Accountability Plan

August 2008, Riverbend was provided with data analysis from the State of Alaska on students' springtime academic performance and staff time to look at the student performance results.

September 2008, District and Principal and a Title I teacher participated in Technical Assistance session on the School/District Improvement Plan.

October 10, 2008, District reviewed elements of the site improvement plan with RVB principal

October 31, 2008, District consulted with RVB Principal, providing final input for the site improvement plan

November 12, 2008 Peer review meeting with Asst. Superintendent and Assessment and Federal Programs administrators to provide additional feedback

November 13, 2008 Site Council final review of improvement plan

**3. Describe the responsibilities of the school and the district in implementing this School Improvement Plan, and any technical assistance the district will provide to the school. (Please contact the department if technical assistance is needed in developing or implementing the plan.)**

Riverbend Elementary School and the District are responsible for implementing the School Improvement Plan. It is the blueprint for how the Riverbend Elementary School community will improve student academic performance.

- The district assists schools with conducting, collecting and analyzing student data through electronic databases that collect cumulative student performance data
- The district assists schools with identifying staff development and providing opportunities for teachers to receive needed professional development and curriculum resources
- The district assists schools with providing the framework and facilitating the structure for teacher collaboration to review student performance data to inform instruction
- The district and the schools plan for school and district improvement collectively, providing technical assistance to inform action steps and identify goals and objectives.
- The district has provided Riverbend Elementary with the technical assistance necessary to submit the attached budget and narrative for the School Improvement Funds allocated: \$9,430. These monies (about \$3500) are planned to fund students who are academically needy but not eligible to be funded from the set-aside allocation in the Title I budget for Supplemental Education Services (SES). The remaining funding will be utilized to provide student transportation to participate in the SES after school program and academic support supplies.

**4. Check each cell in the following table to identify the areas in which the school did NOT meet AYP:**

	All students	Ethnic group	SWD	LEP	Low-Income
Language Arts					X
Math					
Participation					
Grad Rate					

## SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN 2008-2009

**Complete one objective for each District goal – expand sections and add pages as appropriate**

### **DISTRICT MEASURABLE GOAL (to include specific target):**

**Goal #1** All students will reach high standards, at a minimum attaining proficiency or better in reading/language arts or mathematics by 2013-2014.

A. Decrease the number of students by 10% in underachieving sub-groups (ESL/ELL, Alaska Native/Am Indian, Economically Disadvantaged, Students with Disabilities) who perform below proficient on the language arts and math SBAs by improving instructional practices and improving school climate.

### **SCHOOL MEASURABLE OBJECTIVE**

Decrease the number of underachieving students by 10% in sub-groups (ESL/ELL, Alaska Native/Am Indian, Economically Disadvantaged, Students with Disabilities) who perform below proficient on the language arts and math SBAs by improving instructional practices and improving school climate.

### **CURRENT PERFORMANCE LEVEL ON SBAs:**

07-08 AYP 76% Proficient in Language Arts: LEP--67%, Low-Income--64%, Alaska Native/American Indian--66%, and Students with Disabilities--32%

### **Performance Target (Measurable Change):**

08-09 Target: 78.4% Proficient in Language Arts: LEP—70.3%, Low-Income—67.6%, Alaska Native/American Indian—69.4%, and Students with Disabilities—38.8%

### **CURRENT PERFORMANCE LEVEL ON SBAs:**

07-08 AYP 70% Proficient in Math: LEP—72%, Low-Income—57%, Alaska Native/American Indian—57%, and Students with Disabilities—32%

### **Performance Target (Measurable Change):**

08-09 Target: AYP 73% Proficient in Math: LEP—74.8%, Low-Income—64.9%, Alaska Native/American Indian—61.3%, and Students with Disabilities—38.8%

**Scientifically based research to support each strategy listed below (reference or brief description):**

Center for Research on Education, Diversity and Excellence (CREDE) researchers developed a model of high quality sheltered instruction, known as the Making Content Comprehensible for English Learners: the Sheltered Instruction Observation Protocol Model (SIOP). This model is an empirically validated model of sheltered instruction. It provides teacher leaders, teachers, school administrators, staff developers, with an instrument for observing and quantifying a teacher's implementation of quality sheltered instructional strategies. The Juneau School District Instructional Framework is based on the SIOP model and includes a focus on differentiation that incorporates RTI practices.

The Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act passed by the U.S. Congress in November 2004 included language specifically incorporating RTI practices into special education procedures. This research-based practice focuses on pairing students with effective interventions and documenting student progress. The RTI process has been imbedded in the differentiation training elements of the Juneau School District Instructional Framework. The Response to Intervention (RTI) Model aligns well with the SIOP Model and is the core framework of the JSD Instructional Framework.

During the past school year and in August of this school year, the Instructional Support Teams (ISTs) identified for each site, comprised of ESL/ELL, Special Education, Literacy Leaders and Extended Learning teachers, participated in several preparatory trainings including the SIOP-based Juneau School District Instructional Framework, Differentiation Training provided by the Santa Cruz New Teacher Center, and the Response to Intervention Training with Rachel Brown-Chidsey, PhD, Associate Professor and Coordinator of the School Psychology Program at the University of Southern Maine. The Instructional Support Teams participate in monthly staff development collaboration sessions designed to target implementation challenges. The ISTs have developed a wikispace that documents the collective learning and resources utilized to date. For example, the site records the following pieces of research about Response to Intervention, job-embedded staff development, and differentiated instruction that informs the ISTs' work:

- IST members have studied the text: [Response to Intervention: Principles and Strategies for Effective Practice](#), by Rachel Brown-Chidsey and Mark W. Steege.
- The JSD values job-embedded staff development (<http://www.nsd.org/library/publications/jsd/sparks104.cfm>):

The focus of job-embedded staff development is to be through the analysis of student products. Job-embedded staff development means that teachers receive their staff development during their regular workday, on-site, and solve real (as opposed to theoretical) problems based on site goals. Sites may choose job-embedded staff development models including those in five categories defined by [Dennis Sparks, et. al.](#):

**1. Individually-Guided Staff Development**

Individually-guided staff development refers to a process through which teachers plan for and pursue activities they believe will promote their own learning.

**2. Observation/Assessment**

The observation/assessment model provides teachers with objective data and feedback regarding their classroom performance. This process may in itself produce growth or it can provide information that may be used to select areas for growth.

**3. Involvement in a Development/Improvement Process** (Professional Learning Communities <http://www.ncrel.org/sdrs/areas/issues/content/currclum/cu3lk22.htm>)

Involvement in a development/improvement process engages teachers in developing curriculum, designing programs, or engaging in a school improvement process to solve general or particular problems.

**4. Training**

The training model (which may be synonymous with staff development in the minds of many educators) involves teachers in acquiring knowledge or skills through appropriate individual or group instruction.

**5. Inquiry** The inquiry model requires that teachers identify an area of instructional interest, collect data, and make changes in their instruction based on an interpretation of those data.

Collaborative Learning

Action Research / Study Groups (<http://www.ncrel.org/sdrs/areas/issues/content/currclum/cu3lk22.htm>)

- "Making a Difference. [Carol Ann Tomlinson](#) explains how differentiated instruction works and why we need it now." September 10, 2008 Teacher Magazine (online)

Viadero, D. (2007, October 24). Experiments Aim to Ease Effects of "Stereotype Threat. *Education Week*, Vol. 27 (Issue 09), p. 10 cites the academic effect of staff expectations of students on their performance

**Scientifically based research to support strategies listed below (reference, or brief description):**

Positive Behavior Instructional Support is a research-based practice supported by IDEA whose management principles mesh with a Response To Intervention model of supports and decision making about students. Evidence Base for School-wide Positive Behavior Support (Sugai & Horner, 2007) Implementation of PBIS in schools has measurable positive impact on the school climate making it more likely that students will be successful in school. An article called: Academic Achievement and the Implementation of School-wide Behavior Support provides further reference: <http://www.pbis.org/news/New/Newsletters/Newsletter1.aspx>

Improving School Climate can be achieved through Parent Involvement Strategies:

**RIVERBEND School Parent Involvement Plan**

Based on Epstein, et. al 2002. *School, Family, and Community Partnerships: Your Handbook for Action*

[http://www.csos.jhu.edu/p2000/nnps\\_model/school/sixtypes.htm](http://www.csos.jhu.edu/p2000/nnps_model/school/sixtypes.htm)

- Goal 1:** Parenting — Assist families with parenting skills and setting home conditions to support children as students. Also, assist schools to better understand families.
- Goal 2:** Communicating — Conduct effective communications from school-to-home and from home-to-school about school programs and student progress.
- Goal 3:** Volunteering — Organize volunteers and audiences to support the school and students. Provide volunteer opportunities in various locations and at various times.
- Goal 4:** Learning at Home — Involve families with their children on homework and other curriculum-related activities and decisions.
- Goal 5:** Decision Making — Include families as participants in school decisions, and develop parent leaders and representatives.
- Goal 6:** Collaborating with the Community — Coordinate resources and services from the community for families, students, and the school, and provide services to the community.

**Staff Training on Parent involvement**

- \* Work with new staff on how to embed new strategies into your everyday work with families./Scheduled
- \* Share and collaborate ideas with other teachers and staff and learn new strategies for working with families to increase parent involvement in the school and classroom.
- \* Provide information to parents to help them support their children's learning
- \* Make provisions for providing information (flyers, handouts, workshops, voice messages, e-mail, etc.) in ways that all parents can understand.
- \* Providing new information for teachers about how to work with families happens through ongoing, systematic professional development.
- \* Professional development for staff includes understanding how to best work with all families.

**Family Literacy Nights and training from Title 1 staff and Literacy Leaders should be designed to educate parents to:**

- \* Set the climate for learning at home.
- \* Establish routines for children around schoolwork.
- \* Set your expectations for learning.
- \* Be a learner role model. Let your child see you learn about and explore new things.
- \* Provide the tools your child needs to read write and do homework.
- \* Understand child development, and learn new strategies to support learning and that parent education happens through informal conversations, workshops, written communication, one-on-one parent conferences, and a variety of appropriate means of family-centered activities.
- \* Learn strategies on how to ask your child about school and have discussions about learning. And support their literacy.
- \* Build learning relationships with your children.
- \* Recognize themselves as an important teacher of their child.
- \* Take advantage of school parent-child activities including family fun nights and extra curricular activities

**Research based strategies:****Family Literacy—Providing Equal Opportunities**

Caregivers must play a key role in the education of their children. The benefits are clear. When caregivers come to school and become integrally involved in their child's education, it becomes a win-win situation for school and home. Family literacy offered at Riverbend elementary school provides the perfect setting for parents to increase their own learning, while gaining knowledge successful. Family literacy ensures that all families, regardless of their economic or educational background, are given the opportunity to participate in this partnership and influence their own lives and their children's lives in positive ways.

- Increased self confidence in parenting
- Better understanding of school programs
- More interaction with child at home
- More input into policies that affect **child's education**
- **More collaboration with other agencies**

**Build Trusting Relationships**

Without trusting relationships, partnerships often fail. Building relationships is critical for parent-teacher collaboration. In order for parents and teachers to be full partners, rapport and trust must be developed. Relationship building takes time — between parents and teachers, but also between parents and children — particularly if the relationship contains new or changing expectations.

partnership and influence their own lives and their children's lives in positive ways.

- Increased self confidence in parenting
- Better understanding of school programs
- More interaction with child at home
- More input into policies that affect child's education
- More collaboration with other agencies

**Build Trusting Relationships**

Without trusting relationships, partnerships often fail. Building relationships is critical for parent-teacher collaboration. In order for parents and teachers to be full partners, rapport and trust must be developed. Relationship building takes time — between parents and teachers, but also between parents and children — particularly if the relationship contains new or changing expectations.

\* Take advantage of school parent-child activities including family fun nights and extra curricular family centered activities.

\* Learn strategies on how to ask your child about school and have discussions about learning. And support their literacy

ACTION TO IMPLEMENT <u>Action, strategies and interventions</u> (include professional development, mentoring, parent involvement- <u>not programs</u> )	TIMELINE Milestones for current school year	RESOURCES Materials, Estimated costs, funding sources	PERSONS RESPONSIBLE	PROGRESS MONITORING AND EVALUATION	
				EVALUATION (Instrument(s) used to assess)	EVIDENCE OF IMPACT ON STUDENT LEARNING (Outcomes – Review at district only per milestone)
Riverbend's Instructional Support Team (IST) will provide training in using backward design and will collaborate with grade level teachers as they design standards-based integrated units of in science and social studies.	To begin September 2008	General Fund for salaries of IST members; NCLB funding of Title I staff	IST Members	Standards Based Assessment Curriculum based measures	
IST will regularly collaborate with grade level teachers regarding CORE teaching and intervention for students not meeting CORE – using components of the RTI model.	To begin September 2008	Same as above; Cost of substitute enrichment teachers to help cover the enrichment block	IST Members	Standards Based Assessment Curriculum based measurements Formative assessments	
IST – using the district developed “new teacher induction” guidelines will provide staff development through the 5 models of job-embedded staff development listed above.	To begin September 2008	Title I & Title II (Staff Dev Mini-grant) funds for substitutes to support peer observation	IST Members	Teacher Evaluation Standards Based Assessment	

ACTION TO IMPLEMENT <u>Action, strategies and interventions</u> (include professional development, mentoring, parent involvement, <u>not programs</u> )	TIMELINE Milestones for current school year	RESOURCES Materials, Estimated costs, funding sources	PERSONS RESPONSIBLE	PROGRESS MONITORING AND EVALUATION	
				EVALUATION (Instrument used to Measure progress)	EVIDENCE OF IMPACT ON STUDENT LEARNING (Outcomes –provide to district)
PBIS Team formed and goals and objective established for the year.	September 2008	Title I staff participation	Todd Wicks, Content Literacy Teacher	Student Discipline Referrals Standards Based Assessment Curriculum Based Assessment	
Staff and Students trained in school – wide expectations.	September 2008- June 2009	Title I staff participation	Todd Wicks, Content Literacy Teacher	Student Discipline Referrals Standards Based Assessment Curriculum Based Assessment	
School wide Behavior Team formed for providing intervention.	September 2008 is milestone for team organization	Title I staff participate on school-wide team	Carmen Katasse, Principal	Student Discipline Referrals Standards Based Assessment Curriculum Based Assessment	



Behavior Team collaborates with teachers on an as-needed basis regarding students needing help with social skills that is the precursor to being ready to learn.	September 2008- June 2009	Title I (.25 FTE) & General Fund: Counselor (.5FTE) & District Psych (estimated .1 FTE portion of time)	Todd Wicks, Content Literacy Teacher Lynnette Dihle, School Counselor Richard Eaton, District Psychologist	Student Discipline Referrals Standards Based Assessment Curriculum Based Assessment	
--	---------------------------	---	--	---	--

<p><b>RIVERBEND School Parent Involvement Plan</b></p> <p><b>Goal 1:</b> Parenting — Assist families with parenting skills and setting home conditions to support children as students. Also, assist schools to better understand families.</p> <p><b>Goal 2:</b> Communicating — Conduct effective communications from school-to-home and from home-to-school about school programs and student progress.</p> <p><b>Goal 3:</b> Volunteering — Organize volunteers and audiences to support the school and students. Provide volunteer opportunities in various locations and at various times.</p> <p><b>Goal 4:</b> Learning at Home — Involve families with their children on homework and other curriculum-related activities and decisions</p> <p><b>Goal 5:</b> Decision Making — Include families as participants in school decisions, and develop parent.</p> <p><b>Goal 6:</b> Collaborating with the Community — Coordinate</p> <p>Form # 05-09-002 Alaska Department of Education &amp; Early Development</p>	<p>On-going</p>	<p>Parent Involvement Funds in Title I budget, Title I &amp; General Fund staff FTE for school community</p>	<p>Carmen Katasse, Principal &amp; Title I staff &amp; all School Staff</p>	<p><u>EVALUATION instruments &amp; examples of evidence:</u> Staff Training on Parent involvement occurred</p> <p><u>Parenting supports in place:</u> Parent Compacts Family Lending Library Presentations or speakers Conference Data/Collected by Volunteer Coordinator PTO Family Fun nights data/Title 1 Families</p> <p><u>Communication:</u> School Newsletter With Home- School Compact RIVERBEND SCHOOL Website offering information</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Classroom weekly newsletters</li> <li>•Parent/Teacher Conferences (bi-annually)</li> <li>•Capital City Weekly articles</li> <li>•Student Progress Reports</li> </ul> <p><u>Logs of Volunteer Actions:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Parent Volunteers/Title 1</li> <li>•Parent Volunteer Coordinator</li> <li>•Community Volunteers</li> </ul> <p><u>Supports for Learning at Home generated from School to Home and evidenced and collected by Title I staff &amp; Principal of the following:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•School newsletter</li> <li>• School Website</li> <li>•Organizing and monitoring children’s time – especially TV viewing</li> <li>•Assisting with homework</li> <li>•Discussing school related activities and future educational goals</li> <li>•Parent Conferences</li> <li>•After school club involvement</li> <li>•Book fair (mechanisms in place for homeless students to receive free books)</li> <li>•Meaningful parent-child relationships impact children’s academic achievement.</li> <li>•Supporting parent involvement as a partnership strengthens efforts.</li> </ul> <p><u>Parenting:</u> Parent Compacts Family Lending Library Presentations or speakers</p> <p>2008-2009 School Impro</p>	
---	-----------------	--	---	--	--

## SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN 2008-2009

**Complete one objective for each District goal – expand sections and add pages as appropriate**

**DISTRICT MEASURABLE GOAL (to include specific target):**

**Goal #1: All students will reach high standards, at a minimum attaining proficiency or better in reading/language arts or mathematics by 2013-2014.**

B. Decrease the number of students who perform below proficient by 10% in **writing** as indicated on the Alaska State SBAs in all underachieving sub-groups

**SCHOOL MEASURABLE OBJECTIVE (area of need to be addressed):** Decrease the number of underachieving students who perform below proficient by 10% in **writing** as indicated on the Alaska State SBAs in all sub-groups

**CURRENT PERFORMANCE LEVEL ON SBAs:**

07-08 AYP 72.6% Proficient in writing:

(LEP—67%, Low-Income—60.3%, Alaska Native/American Indian—64.6%, and Students with Disabilities—24.1%)

**Performance Target (Measurable Change):**

08-09 Target: AYP 75.3% Proficient in writing:

(LEP—70.3%, Low-Income—64.6%, Alaska Native/American Indian—68.1%, and Students with Disabilities—31.7%)

**Scientifically based research to support each strategy listed below (reference or brief description):**

Science Notebooks (Inquiry-Based) is a strategy to improve student achievement in science, but concurrently, in reading, writing, and mathematics as evidenced by a study by Amaral et al., 2002 and Jorgenson and Vanosdall, 2002 that underscores a strong relationship between inquiry-based science instruction and improved achievement. Science notebooks link science and literacy when the notebooks are used as a form of writing in constructing meaning with science experience.

Creating Writers through standards based instruction and the analytical assessment is a research based achievement cycle model for six trait writing instruction validated through the Northwest Regional Education Laboratory.

Research supports aligned, shared rubrics and an emphasis on informative writing: High Performance in High Poverty School: 90/90/90 and Beyond by Douglas B. Reeves from the Center for Performance Assessment (2003).

ACTION TO IMPLEMENT <u>Action, strategies and interventions</u> (include professional development, mentoring, parent involvement- <u>not programs</u> )	TIMELINE Milestones for current school year	RESOURCES (MATERIALS), ESTIMATED COSTS, FUNDING SOURCES	PERSONS RESPONSIBLE	PROGRESS MONITORING AND EVALUATION	
				EVALUATION (INSTRUMENT(S) USED TO ASSESS))	EVIDENCE OF IMPACT ON STUDENT LEARNING (OUTCOMES – REVIEW AT DISTRICT ONLY PER MILESTONE)
Teachers will be trained in using Science Journals and will incorporate their use within backwards-designed units as well as CORE teaching.	October 2008	\$2,150 (materials, contracted staff development presenters (Title II, Staff Dev Mini-grants), Title I / General Fund teachers/Title II Staff Development staff-L. Frame)	Linda Frame Carmen Katasse	Determine frequency of using the Science Journal method within classrooms  Standards Based Science Assessment Curriculum Based Measures Writing Assessment	
Staff will study: High Performance in High Poverty School: 90/90/90 and Beyond by Douglas B. Reeves from the Center for Performance Assessment (2003).	October 2008	Title I / Title II funds to provide Collaboration Time (Staff Development mini-grant \$2500)	Carmen Katasse, Principal	Standard Based Measurements Curriculum Based Measures Formative Assessments Students are able to articulate their learning targets in reading,	
Staff development will be provided in writing using the 6 Traits of Writing	February – April, 2009	Title I Staff 1.0 FTE	Karen Doxey, Title I Teacher	Teacher Evaluation Standards Based Assessment	

## SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN 2008-2009

**Complete one objective for each District goal – expand sections and add pages as appropriate**

**DISTRICT MEASURABLE GOAL (to include specific target):**

**Goal #1** All students will reach high standards, at a minimum attaining proficiency or better in reading/language arts or mathematics by 2013-2014.

C. Decrease the number of students who perform below proficient by 10% in **reading** as indicated on the Alaska State SBAs in all underachieving sub-groups

**SCHOOL MEASURABLE OBJECTIVE (area of need to be addressed):**

Decrease the number of underachieving students who perform below proficient by 10% in **reading** as indicated on the Alaska State SBAs in all sub-groups

**CURRENT PERFORMANCE LEVEL ON SBAs:**

07-08 AYP % Proficient in reading: 77.9%

(LEP—74%, Low-Income—65.9%, Alaska Native/American Indian—66.7%, and Students with Disabilities—27.6%)

**Performance Target (Measurable Change):**

08-09 Target: AYP % Proficient in reading: 80.1%

(LEP—76.6%, Low-Income—69.3%, Alaska Native/American Indian--70%, and Students with Disabilities—34.8%)

**Scientifically based research to support each strategy listed below (reference or brief description):**

The Juneau School District Reading Program is rooted in an interactive view of the reading process and a balanced view of reading instruction. This reflects current federal reading initiatives by merging key elements of instruction (National Reading Panel, 2000) components of a balanced literacy program (Ministry of Education , New Zealand).

Based on current research evidence, the following definition of reading, derived from Snow, Burns, and Griffin (1998) is used in the Juneau School District.

Reading is a complex system of deriving meaning from print that requires all of the following:

- The skills and knowledge to understand how phonemes or speech sounds are connected to print
- The development and maintenance of a motivation to read
- The development of explicit active strategies to construct meaning from print
- Sufficient oral language, background information and vocabulary to foster reading comprehension

A multi-dimensional approach to reading assessment with consistent assessments across grades is a researched based strategy for consistently information and improving instruction.

The *Fast Forward* program has an extensive research base. A supplemental literacy program, the conclusion from the variety of studies listed below indicate that the program promotes significant gains in oral language comprehension, speech discrimination, grammar and syntax.

-De Anda I. (2000). Glasses for the Ears: Technology provides a critical link to literacy, *Multimedia Schools: A Practical Journal of Technology, including Multimedia, CD-ROM, Online, Internet, & Hardware in K-12*, 7(2).

-*Programs and Practices: Fast ForWord* (2003). Education Commission of the States.

-Schachter J. (1999). *Reading Programs that Work: A review of programs for Pre-Kindergarten to 4th grade*. Milken Family Foundation.

-Wahl M, Robinson C, Torgesen J. (2003). *Florida Center for Reading Research: Fast ForWord Language*. Florida Center for Reading Research.

-What Works Clearinghouse (2007, July), *Beginning Reading: Fast ForWord*. U.S. Department of Education: Institute of Education Sciences.

-What Works Clearinghouse (2006, September), *English Language Learners: Fast ForWord Language (2006)*. U.S. Department of Education: Institute of Education Sciences.

Building Knowledge in Guided Reading/ Fountas and Purnell

ACTION TO IMPLEMENT <u>Action, strategies and interventions</u> (include professional development, mentoring, parent involvement-not programs)	TIMELINE Milestones for current school year	RESOURCES (MATERIALS), ESTIMATED COSTS, FUNDING SOURCES	PERSONS RESPONSIBLE	PROGRESS MONITORING AND EVALUATION	
				EVALUATION (INSTRUMENT(S) USED TO ASSESS))	EVIDENCE OF IMPACT ON STUDENT LEARNING (OUTCOMES – REVIEW AT DISTRICT ONLY PER MILESTONE)
Implement a Supplemental Education Services program, as part of a AKDEED pilot program, at Riverbend Elementary, a Title I school, that offers after-school academic support for Free and Reduced Lunch Eligible students	August 2008 – February 2009	NCLB, Title I Set-Aside & \$9,430 in School Improvement Funds provided through State Dept of Ed/Early Dev.	OIS/Federal Programs: KHomme & Riverbend Principal, CKatasse	Degrees of Reading Power, PALS Assessment, Reading Continuum Markings, CORE Reading markings, State SBAs	
<p>All students along with extra support for title 1 students will receive Direct Explicit Guided and Shared reading reading using researched based strategies (Fountas and Pinnell 2001)</p> <p>Differentiated Instruction using</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Data driven, systematic intervention model for enrichment, extension and remediation.</li> <li>• Explicit Instruction in Reading Comprehension and the 5 components of reading</li> </ul>	On-going	Making Meaning Leveled Reading Books Plato Learning Fountas and Pinnell Literacy Centers	Instructional Support Team (IST)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Have the Instructional Support Team and Title I Literacy Leader support teachers in differentiating instruction based on student data.</li> <li>• Help teachers develop a broad repertoire of instructional strategies to meet the needs of the students.</li> <li>• Teaching, modeling and coaching for explicit instruction in comprehension.</li> <li>• Ongoing staff development in Professional Learning Communities purpose and procedures.</li> <li>• Providing resources and support for Juneau School District curriculum.</li> <li>• Provide scope and sequence for core skills with intervention strategies.</li> </ul>	
Staff development about balanced literacy practices and resources through the 5 categories of staff development listed above.	Sept 2008- June 2009	Books, Title I funded Literacy Leader, Title I/Title II funded Teacher extra duty	Karen Doxey, Brenda Weaver, Title I Teachers (2.0 FTE)	Developmental Reading Assessment, Degrees of Reading Power, PALs assessment, Standards Based Assessment	

Fast Forward computer-based literacy intervention provided to 2 <sup>nd</sup> grade students not proficient in reading—in addition to direct instruction strategies. (In other grade levels, students primarily have explicit direct instruction methods utilized)	October 2008-June 2009	Title I Funded Teaching Staff, General Fund Literacy staff	Karen Doxey Instructional Support Team (IST) Principal District OIS	PALs Assessment Developmental Reading Assessment	
--	------------------------	--	--	---	--



## SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN 2008-2009

**Complete one objective for each District goal – expand sections and add pages as appropriate**

**DISTRICT MEASURABLE GOAL (to include specific target):**

**Goal #1** All students will reach high standards, at a minimum attaining proficiency or better in reading/language arts or mathematics by 2013-2014.

D. Decrease the number of students who perform below proficient by 10% in **math** as indicated on the Alaska State SBAs in all underachieving sub-groups

**SCHOOL MEASURABLE OBJECTIVE (area of need to be addressed):** Decrease the number of underachieving students who perform below proficient by 10% in **math** as indicated on the Alaska State SBAs

**CURRENT PERFORMANCE LEVEL ON SBAs:**

07-08 AYP 70% Proficient in Math

**Performance Target (Measurable Change):**

08-09 Target: AYP 73% Proficient in Math

**Scientifically based research to support each strategy listed below (reference or brief description):**

Cognitively Guided Instruction (CGI) is recognized by the Promising Practices Network, Education Reform Network, and the North Central Regional Educational Laboratory as a skill set that meets the Standards established by the National Council of Teachers of Mathematics.

Math in a Cultural Context (MCC) is an Native Alaska based supplemental mathematics program which supports student learning through relevant activities. This program is backed by a strong and continuous research base.

ACTION TO IMPLEMENT Action, strategies and interventions (include professional development, mentoring, parent involvement-not programs)	TIMELINE Milestones for current school year	RESOURCES MATERIALS, ESTIMATED COSTS, FUNDING SOURCES	PERSONS RESPONSIBLE	PROGRESS MONITORING AND EVALUATION	
				EVALUATION (Instrument(s) used to assess)	EVIDENCE OF IMPACT ON STUDENT LEARNING (Outcomes – Review at district only per milestone)
Staff development with CGI will be provided.	December 2008	Title II Staff Dev Mini-grant, Title I staff	Brenda Weaver, Title I Staff	Curriculum Based Measures Standards Based Measurements	
Staff development to articulate Math Grade Level Expectations within the Trailblazer curriculum.	On-going	Trailblazers	Principal, RVB Staff	Formative assessments SBA data	

Staff development to better utilize effective Math support curriculum resources & strategies: • Math in the Cultural Context • Marilyn Burns Math Intervention • Investigations • Everyday Math • Cognitive Guided Instruction (CGI) • Continental Math League	On-going	Title II Staff Development (utilizing the district resource person who is a .3 FTE with a Science/Math Elem focus)	Title I RVB Staff Facilitation, OIS Curriculum staff consultant, Linda Frame	Formative assessments SBA data	
--	----------	--	--	-----------------------------------	--

# School Improvement 2008-2009 CORRECTIVE ACTION ADDENDUM

*To be completed by the District for each Title I site in Level 4*

For Title I school improvement sites at Level 4, districts are required to take one of the following actions to be implemented during the current school year. Please indicate the action being implemented by checking the box next to the action selected and provide information as to how the action will be accomplished.

- ☐ 1. Replace the school staff who are relevant to the failure to make adequate yearly progress;
- ☐ 2. Institute and fully implement a new curriculum, including providing appropriate professional development for all relevant staff, that is based on scientifically based research and offers substantial promise of improving educational achievement for low-achieving students and enabling the school to make adequate yearly progress;
- ☐ 3. Significantly decrease management authority at the school level;
- ☐ 4. Appoint an outside expert to advise the school on its progress toward making adequate yearly progress, based on its School Improvement Plan under NCLB 1116(b);
- ☐ 5. Extend the school year or school day for the school; or
- ☐ 6. Restructure the internal organizational structure of the school.

ACTION TO IMPLEMENT <u>Action, strategies and interventions</u> (include professional development, mentoring, parent involvement, <u>not programs</u> )	TIMELINE Milestones for current school year	RESOURCES Materials, Estimated costs, funding sources	PERSONS RESPONSIBLE	PROGRESS MONITORING AND EVALUATION	
				EVALUATION (Instrument used to Measure progress)	EVIDENCE OF IMPACT ON STUDENT LEARNING (Outcomes –provide to district)